



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fw  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,475	09/28/2000	Robert E. Coye	3493.85418	8516
26652	7590	11/16/2006	EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP. ROOM 2A207 ONE AT&T WAY BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921				NGUYEN, PHU K
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2628		

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/672,475	COYE, ROBERT E.	
	Examiner Phu K. Nguyen	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



PHU K. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2300

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NGO et al. (5,933,150) in view of KROITOR (5,854,634).

As per claim 1, Ngo teaches the claimed "electronic display system operative to facilitate interactive graphical interface animation by a user", comprising:

"a central processing unit, coupled to a system bus; a memory unit coupled to the system bus and having loaded therein an operating system, application programs and computer-executable instructions" (Ngo, column 5, lines 46-67) for:

"inserting a desired image onto a first window" (Ngo, a simple stick figure; column 6, lines 8-10);

"inserting anchors onto a second window by, for each anchor, selecting a desired pose from a plurality of predetermined poses" (Ngo, the state space; column 6, lines 47-67); and

"a display unit coupled to the system bus" (Ngo, display 128);

"a cursor control unit arranged to provide signals to control movement of a cursor on the display unit" (Ngo, the cursor control 126); and

"the system bus, for linking the central processing unit, the display unit, the memory unit, and the cursor control unit" (Ngo, the internal bus 122).

It is noted that Ngo does not explicitly teach “upon a cursor being dragged over the second window to a desired anchor, additively applying characteristics for the desired anchor to the desired image based on a proximity of the cursor to the desired dot anchor.” Ngo teaches that any point within the state zones is a combination of the poses according to the vertices of the zones (Ngo, column 7, lines 15-30). Kroitor teaches that the cursor is used to drag or move the points within the state zones (Kroitor, column 6, lines 24-46). It would have been obvious in view of the teaching of Kroitor to user Ngo’s cursor to move or drag the position of the animated character state’s point within its state control zone because such continuous moving or dragging continuous transformations of the image poses constructed from a source poses (Kroitor, column 7, lines 36-52).

Claim 2 adds into claim 1 “the characteristics for the anchors are at least one of facial expressions; poses; and camera positions” (Ngo, figures 2A-2D).

Claim 3 adds into claim 1 “a computer display system” (Ngo, the computer system; figure 1; column 5, lines 46-67).

Claim 4 adds into claim 1 “combining a plurality of desired anchors to form a compound anchor” (Ngo, column 7, lines 15-30).

Claim 5 adds into claim 1 the selection of a desired image to be inserted onto the first window (Ngo, column 22, lines 24-50; or Kroitor, the source poses). It is noted that the cited references do not teach the desired image or model is listed on “a palette in a third window shown on the display unit” as claimed. However, it would have been

obvious to list the items on a palette for a user to select one of these items (official notice) because it provides a visual perception of the selected items to the user in selection process.

Claims 6-10 claim a method based on the system of claims 1-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Claims 11-14 claim a computer readable medium to store the computer instructions to perform the functions of the system in claims 1-5; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

As per claim 16, Ngo teaches the claimed “method for facilitating animation using a graphics-based graphical user interface”, comprising the steps of:

“a pointer is positioned over an arrangement of a plurality of anchors in a controller window wherein each anchor represents a displacement of a state of a graphics-based object from a base state” (Ngo, column 8, lines 30-54); and “redrawing/updating the base state of the object in a display window in accordance with the proximity of the pointer to the anchors as the pointer is placed over the controller window” (Ngo, any point within the state zones is a combination of the poses according to the vertices of the zones; Ngo, column 7, lines 15-30).

It is noted that Ngo does not explicitly teach “a cursor being dragged over the anchor zone.” Kroitor teaches that the cursor is used to drag or move the points within the state zones (Kroitor, column 6, lines 24-46). It would have been obvious in view of

the teaching of Kroitor to user Ngo's cursor to move or drag the position of the animated character state's point within its state control zone because such continuous moving or dragging continuous transformations of the image poses constructed from a source poses (Kroitor, column 7, lines 36-52).

Claim 16 adds into claim 15 "positions of the plurality of anchors in the controller window are set by the user" (Ngo, the designer; column 7, lines 60-61).

Claim 17 adds into claim 16 "the user uses the pointer to position the plurality of anchors" (Ngo, the set up of state zone; column 7, lines 60-66; see also Kroitor, column 7, lines 15-17).

Claim 18 adds into claim 17 "each target has a predetermined area of influence that is used to determine, based on a position of the pointer, the displacement to be applied to the graphics-based object" (Ngo, column 7, lines 15-59; see also Kroitor, column 8, lines 40-61).

Claim 19 adds into claim 15 the state of the object is redrawn/updated by putting the graphics-based object into a default base state when a position of the pointer changes, then applying anchors to the object based on a weighting of each anchor, wherein the weighting is calculated based on the displacement of the pointer from the anchor" (Ngo, column 7, lines 15-59; see also Kroitor, column 8, lines 40-61).

Claim 20 adds into claim 15 “each redrawing/updating of the base state of the graphics-based object is recorded to provide an animation path” (Ngo, column 8, line 56 to column 9, line 7; see also Kroitor, column 8, line 62 to column 9, line 64).

Claim 21 adds into claim 15 “the animation path is editable” (Ngo, column 7, lines 61-66; Kroitor, column 11, lines 22-31).

Claim 22 adds into claim 15 “multiple anchors with individual weightings are applied simultaneously” (Ngo, column 7, lines 15-30; see also Kroitor, column 7, lines 56-61).

Claims 23-30 claim a computer readable medium storing the computer instructions to perform the steps of claims 15-22; therefore, they are rejected under the same reason.

Due to new grounds of the rejection, this action has been made NON-FINAL.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272 7645. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi can be reached on (571) 272 7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Phu K. Nguyen  
November 10, 2006

*Phu K. Nguyen*  
PHU K. NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2300